



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/977,374	11/24/97	BAKKER	W GLP006/JTN

JAMES T NENNIGER
PIASETZKI & PIASETZKI
120 ADELAIDE STREET WEST
SUITE 2308
TORONTO ON MAH 1T1
CANADA

IM71/1124

EXAMINER

WATKINS III, W

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1772

//

AIR MAIL

DATE MAILED:

11/24/98

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or
proceeding.**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/977,374

Applicant(s)

Bakker Hal

Examiner

W. Watkins

Group Art Unit

1772

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period of Response

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a response be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11-6-98
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 21-23, 42-46, 36-46 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) 1-9, 21-23, 42-46 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 36-46 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s) 3 sheets
filed 11-6-98
- ☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1772

DETAILED ACTION

1. The finality of the office action mailed August 4, 1998, is withdrawn in view of applicant's arguments in the paper filed Nov. 6, 1998. The action mailed August 4, 1998 is replaced by the instant office action and the period for response restarted with the mailing date of the instant office action.

2. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

There is no antecedent basis for "said tinting". The language "said tint" would be accepted.

3. Claims 36-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

It is not clear where the new language in the base claims, that the film is transparent to radiant energy and remains

Art Unit: 1772

unchanged when exposed to radiant energy, is supported in the original specification. The examiner finds no explicit reference to transparency and no explicit reference to the film remaining unchanged when exposed to radiant energy. There is language that opaque coatings and tints increase absorbance of radiant energy. These do not directly imply that the film is transparent or that it remains unchanged when subjected to any type of radiant energy. The specific language regarding susceptors in the new claims is also without explicit support.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 36-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heilman et al. (Australia 27,337) in view of Konger (U.S. 3,760,154) further in view of Anderson et al. (U.S. 5,113,479).

Art Unit: 1772

Heilman et al. teach a film which extends over the rim of a container and is heat shrunk onto the container by applying energy which may be in the form of infrared radiation to the edge first while the top is shielded, then to the top as an option to further tighten the film (page 10). The film may be transparent (page 3). Konger teaches the use of infrared radiant heat directly on the overhanging edge of a transparent shrink wrap film in order to form a cover over an object to be packaged, the direct radiation on the edge is intense (abstract, col. 2, lines 35-45, col. 6, lines 60-69, col. 10, lines 15-25). Anderson et al. teach the use of coloring on a edge to better absorb infrared radiation to raise the temperature to heat seal the edge of the film (abstract). The instant invention claims a printed area on the edge rim of a film lid to better absorb radiation in order to heat shrink the film. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to direct the infrared radiation of Heilman et al. directly on the edge of Heilman et al. in order to better shrink the transparent edge of Heilman et al. because of the teachings of Konger to use intense direct radiation on overhanging edges to be shrunk. It further would have been obvious to color the edge of the film of Heilman et al. in view of Konger in order to use less intense infrared energy but still cause shrinking in order to save energy because of the teachings

Art Unit: 1772

of Anderson et al. that use of opaque areas increase absorbance of infrared radiation. Use of film in a roll to make lids and printing and use of tint to create opaque areas for infrared absorption are conventional.

6. The non-statutory double patenting rejection, whether of the obviousness-type or non-obviousness-type, is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent. *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); and *In re Goodman*, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(b) and © may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.78(d).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

7. Claims 36-46 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 15, 16 and 19 of copending Application No. 08/699,332. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other

Art Unit: 1772

because the claims differ only in the language used to describe the same structure.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 36-46 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William P. Watkins III whose telephone number is (703) 308-2420.

The examiner's normal work hours are Monday through Friday 9:30 A.M. through 6:00 P.M. The examiner's supervisor is Ellis Robinson whose telephone number is (703) 308-2364. Any general inquiry can be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0651.

The Fax number for official **after final** papers is 703-305-3599. The Fax number for official **non-final** papers is 703-305-5408. The Fax number for **informal** non-official communications directed to the examiner is 703-305-5436.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [ellis.robinson@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality

Serial Number: 08/977,374

Page 7

Art Unit: 1772

requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.



**WILLIAM P. WATKINS III
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

WW/ww

November 20, 1998